1957

Content analysis methods applied to literary criticism| Plays of Christopher Marlowe

Molly Lynn Duffell
The University of Montana

CONTENT ANALYSIS METHODS APPLIED TO LITERARY CRITICISM: PLAYS OF CHRISTOPHER MARLOWE

by

MOLLY LYNN DUFFELL

B.A., Montana State University, 1956

Presented in partial fulfillment

of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY

1957

Approved by:

Ken Carpenter
Chairman, Board of Examiners

Ellis Waldron
Dean, Graduate School

7-1-57
Date

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	THE PROBLEM	1
II.	THE METHODS	9
	The Jew of Malta	9
	Tamburlaine the Great	25
	Doctor Faustus	42
III.	CONCLUSIONS	53
BIBLIOGRAPHY		57

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I.	Patterns of Value-Analysis	12
II.	Frequency With Which Indicated Values are Expressed in Each Act of *The Jew of Malta* . . .	17
III.	Barabas' Ten Most Emphasized Values in *The Jew of Malta*	19
IV.	Barabas' Evaluation of Characters in *The Jew of Malta*	20
V.	Goals Sought by Major Characters	28
VI.	Distribution of Emphasis Among All Goals Mentioned in *Tamburlaine the Great*	30
VII.	The Ten Most Emphasized Goals in *Tamburlaine the Great*	31
VIII.	Frequency with Which Goals are Expressed by Characters in Each Act of *Tamburlaine the Great*	32
IX.	Individual Needs	44
X.	Faustus' Needs in Order of Importance in *Doctor Faustus*	46

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Every time an individual tries to interpret or evaluate a given experience, he is confronted with a baffling psychological problem: how much of his interpretation comes from the actual events, and how much reflects his own predilections, prejudices and biases? Are his conclusions congruent with those that another individual in his position would have reached? Will other observers agree with him? Or are his conclusions so personal that they will have meaning only for someone who happens to approach the problem with the same preconceptions and subjective points of reference? In short, how close does what he sees come to what is actually there?

In the field of literature, every critic would like to think that he has achieved the ideal, that his analyses reflect an accurate picture of "what is actually there." He wants to cover new territory, but he also wants to map it so that others will follow his footsteps and agree upon his landmarks. But the critic, like any other man, is caught in a "perceptual box"; what he sees in his materials is limited both by the scope of his knowledge and by the selective nature of his own perception. Of course, in going

through the process of analytical criticism he does not consciously leave out significant data, but each man, each critic, has blind spots. He will miss details simply because he does not know that they are there. Or if he works with a theory in mind--even an unverbalized, hazy, mental picture of what he expects to find in the material--he may unconsciously warp the details to fit the theory.

It was from recognition of the critic's problem that this study arose. The method of analyzing literary materials proposed in the following pages is an attempt to solve some of the limitations of the "perceptual box," to make it possible for the critic, whether student or expert, to objectify his findings and thus come closer to seeing what is really there.[1]

Social scientists are concerned with the same problem. They, like literary critics, are caught in the same predicament, and they have attempted to find a way out. Their field of study--the nature of man--is essentially that in which the critic is interested, and their specific areas of concentration often overlap those of the critic. We can most easily state the parallel between the literary critic

[1] I am indebted to Dr. Andrew W. Halpin, of Montana State University, for suggesting the possibility of applying social science techniques to literary criticism, and for his assistance as a consultant.

and the social scientist by saying that they both study the human being; but the critic approaches his study via the existing body of imaginative literature, and the social scientist usually gathers his data from living humans. The two disciplines proceed in the same direction.

Two areas of social science come particularly close to literary criticism: personality analysis and content analysis. The former is, of course, part of the psychologist's domain; the latter perhaps needs further explanation. Content analysis is the term applied by the social psychologist to the study of various kinds of communications. It has been used in monitoring enemy broadcasts during World War II, in the study of other kinds of propaganda, in analyzing the clinical records and autobiographies of patients. It is essentially a method for codifying such information as is contained in any document of communication.

Some of the psychologists doing content analysis or personality analysis have sought a way out of their dilemma by creating master lists of content factors--schemata arrived at without reference to a particular set of data and applied, in turn, to different materials. By means of these schemata they have partially circumvented the preconceptions of the individual researcher and the idiosyncracies of individual insight. The criteria presented in such a

master lists are postulated on theoretical grounds, independent of fortuitous examples; thus the criteria do not contain a bias towards a particular study. Such selectivity or bias as remains in a resulting study is caused by misapplication of the schema to the raw material, and is not inherent in the schema itself.

Of course, this method imposes a new kind of limitation upon the researcher who uses it--and upon the critic who adapts the psychologist's plan for use with imaginative literature. In the end, this method can be no more comprehensive than are the master lists. Thus a "good" list can produce a "good" study, and a "bad" list can never give exciting or particularly original results.[2] It may be objected that unless the researcher or the critic is omniscient, unless he can make an ultimately comprehensive list, there are bound to be large holes in his results. This is perfectly true. But this method--the objective analysis by means of a theoretically oriented schema--still offers two steps forward out of the "perceptual box." The list used in a particular study, though it may not be all-inclusive, is better than an unverbalized list in the critic's mind,

[2] For a comparison of the lists used in this study, and for an indication of the variation in their quality, see Chapter II.

and the procedure of using the list is systematic. Even if the lists used are no more comprehensive than the unspoken "ideas" which the critic uses in a purely subjective approach, they still produce order from chaos, system from randomness. By using the lists, we are aiming our darts instead of throwing them blindfold.

Use of an objective analysis process in literary criticism does not mean that the method of criticism need be changed; in fact, analytic critics are already groping toward just such a process. The critic reads a work as a whole, forming a few tentative ideas of what its importance may be; then he reads again to note specific techniques, characters, ideas, attitudes, tone, imagery, and statements of fact which enter into the work. By taking all these attributes of the work into account, he tries to arrive at an interpretation of the meaning of the work as a whole. Or in a more exhaustive criticism, he may deal with only one aspect at a time, seeking to discover, for example, how the writer's development of female characters reflects the statement of total meaning, or how the use of metaphor extends the meaning to different levels.

The objective analysis process affects only the middle step of criticism: the gathering of information to support the tentative thesis of "what the book is all about." The

critic's own perceptions and individual biases are still the basis for deciding, in the beginning, what he is going to look for and, in the end, what he is going to do with what he has found. But the subjective approach is a hindrance--particularly in this middle step; thus objective analysis is available for the critic at the precise point where it is most valuable for him.

White,[3] a psychologist whose work is summarized later in this study, gives an intelligent and coherent report on how objective analysis and subjective interpretation of data can be integrated to produce better critical studies. White sees four main advantages in the method:

1. Reliability: agreement between various persons making separate observations is possible.

2. Intelligibility: a relatively clear definition of vague and ambiguous terms can be made.

3. Inclusiveness: facts and aspects of the data are seen which might not otherwise be noticed because of the observer's own limitations and preconceptions; omissions are not completely eliminated, but are markedly reduced.

4. Comparability: it becomes easier to see the relative importance of various facts noted, to place items

[3] See below, p. 9ff.

correctly in an outline of value.[4]

Some work with objective analysis has already appeared in the field of criticism. The group of critics who are interested in form have begun to do studies based on just such a method, though on the whole their tendency is merely to gather material in random fashion, rather than to impose criteria formulated theoretically. It is, of course, easier to do this kind of objective analysis of forms. Nevertheless, it may be of some interest to know how this process has already been applied in literary criticism.

Edith Rickert and a group of graduate students at the University of Chicago made, some years ago, a series of experiments in the analysis of literary form.[5] The study is essentially one of creating graphic methods for charting imagery, words, thought patterns, rhythm, tone and visual devices. While the methodology seems valid, it is of use only for an extremely detailed study, and it is highly time-consuming.

Caroline Spurgeon has also made a detailed study of

[4] Ralph K. White, "Black Boy: A Value Analysis," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLII (1947), 441-42.

[5] The results are published in: Edith Rickert, New Methods for the Study of Literature (Chicago, 1927).

Shakespeare's imagery.[6] The study was designed with a dual purpose: to show the imagery as it relates to Shakespeare's own personality, and as it sheds light on the themes and characters of the plays. She has grouped the imagery in various categories of subject matter; e.g., weather, animals, the arts, learning, and so forth. Again, the system is anchored to the material. Hart, also working with Shakespeare, has done a series of arithmetical calculations of vocabulary in Shakespeare's plays.[7]

Various other critics, among them Josephine Miles,[8] have made counts of common vocabularies, individual words, average syllabic length of words and other such items. The only other way in which objective analysis has been made a part of the critic's scheme is in a few psychological studies which attempt to investigate an author's personality via his written works. The latter, much like the psychologists' studies of clinical conversations and autobiographies, are of little importance to the literary critic.

6 Caroline F.E. Spurgeon, Shakespeare's Imagery and What it Tells Us (New York, 1936).

7 A. Hart, Shakespeare and the Homilies (Melbourne, Australia, 1934), Ch. 4.

8 The Continuity of Poetic Language: Studies in English Poetry From the 1540's to the 1940's (Berkeley, 1951).

CHAPTER II

THE METHODS

Having identified the nature of the critic's problem, we may now turn to a specific instance of the objective method and its application to a particular body of literature--Christopher Marlowe's plays. The Jew of Malta has been examined in the light of White's patterns of human values; Tamburlaine the Great, by means of Dale's list of goals and Doctor Faustus with Murray's outline of individual needs. The plays have been considered in the light of these three different content schemata in order to show the possibilities of the general method rather than to explore any specific technique in depth.

The Jew of Malta. Analysis of The Jew of Malta has been made by using White's pattern of value-analysis. White generated a list of the major values found in human beings, grouped these values into categories and developed a system for coding them. He proposed his scheme chiefly for the use of the clinical psychologist, who is confronted by the problem of sorting patients' value patterns in order to treat their disorders. White has proposed that his method be used for any kind of autobiographical material,

and has suggested that it reveals aspects of the writer's personality which cannot be gained from subjective analysis. He states that the purpose of value-analysis is:

> to provide a method by which any kind of verbal data--e.g., propaganda and public-opinion materials, as well as autobiographies, clinical interviews, and other devices of personality study--can be described with a maximum of objectivity and at the same time with a maximum of relevance to the underlying emotional dynamics....It is, in fact, one form of content-analysis.[9]

To illustrate his method, White made a study of Black Boy, the autobiography of Richard Wright.[10] But there is no reason why his method need be confined to autobiographical material and clinical records alone.

In order to adapt White's method to the criticism of imaginative literature, it is necessary only to restate the objectives of such a study. The analysis of The Jew of Malta is based on exactly the same procedures that White used, but its purpose is to explicate a character rather than the author. Thus only Barabas' speeches have been used as material, though it is, of course, necessary to interpret them in context. The immediate goal of the study is to examine Barabas' character, but it is obvious that such an examination sheds light on the total meaning of the play.

[9] White, "Black Boy," p. 440.

[10] Ibid., pp. 440-461.

The criteria for the evaluation are taken directly from White's own list, except for a necessary substitution of Person-Symbols peculiar to this play, and adaptations of Symbol-Combinations from examples found in The Jew of Malta. The lists of symbols here, as in the schemata applied to other plays, are merely expedient devices. They provide a shorthand for making marginal notations in the text itself, and they may be easily counted in the tabulation of results. In most cases, the marginal notations of symbols were taken from explicit statements on the part of Barabas, but occasionally an inferred, non-intended meaning has been included where the inference was clearly justified. Table I is the list of values used in analyzing The Jew of Malta.

Again we may turn to White for a statement of the possibilities of using this data, and for an explanation of how this method fits into the total scheme of criticism:

> From such symbols as these it is possible to tabulate what values are mentioned most often and with most emphasis....It is also possible to tabulate the most frequent evaluative descriptions of each individual who is described....The interpretation then involves challenging each of these totals in terms of what makes sense in the light of the picture as a whole.[11]

The critic needs to keep in mind the fact that his job

[11] White, "Black Boy," pp. 445-46. Italics mine.

TABLE I

PATTERNS OF VALUE-ANALYSIS

I. GOALS

Physiological

F	Food
Sx	Sex
Re	Rest
Ac	Activity
He	Health
S	Safety
Co	Comfort

Social

L	Sex-Love
Lo	Family-Love
Fr	Friendship
Un	Understanding

Egoistic

I	Independence
A	Achievement
Do	Dominance
Ag	Aggression
R	Recognition
St	Strength
In	Intelligence
Ap	Appearance
Sf	Self-Regard

Fearful

Se	Emotional Security
-S	Stability
Sc	Seclusion
Cn	Concealment
Fo	Forgetting
Es	Escape

Playful

N	New Experience
Ex	Excitement
B	Beauty
H	Humor
Fa	Fantasy
Cr	Creative Self-Expression

Practical

P	Practicality
E	Economic Value
J	Job
W	Hard Work
O	Ownership

Cognitive

K	Knowledge

Miscellaneous

Ho	Hope
Pr	Progress
Na	Naturalness
Ha	Happiness
V	Value-in-general

II. STANDARDS OF JUDGMENT

Moral

M	Morality
Tr	Truthfulness
Pu	Purity
Ju	Justice
Rl	Religion

Moral-Social

Ob	Obedience
Li	Likeness (Conformity
Ma	Manners
Mo	Modesty

TABLE I (continued)

Moral-Social (continued)		Ju	(I want) justice
		'Tr	Lying
G	Generosity	--K	Having knowledge
T	Tolerance	Ag_c	(I want) aggression against Christians
U	Group Unity	$'T_j$	(There is) no tolerance of Jews
Miscellaneous		$c'S_j$	Christians are not safe for Jews; i.e., they are dangerous
D	Determination		
C	Carefulness	Cn_c	Concealment from Christians
Cl	Cleanness		
Md	Moderation	K_d	Knowledge about my daughter
Pl	Pleasant Personality		
Ci	Civilization	j(ER	Jews want economic recognition
Ad	Adjustment		
		Ag--Ju	Aggression leading to justice; revenge
III. PERSON-SYMBOLS			
		Cn=M	Concealment equals morality
j	Jews		
c	Christians	Rl/EA	Religion conflicting with economic achievement
d	Daughter		
i	I (Barabas)		
		S>R	Safety is more important than recognition
IV. SYMBOL-COMBINATIONS			
		[Do	Dominance; an inferred meaning
iEA	I have economic achievement	EA	Economic achievement; wealth
jIn	Jews are intelligent	IA	Independent achievement
cSf	Christians are self-regarding	EA--Ha	Economic achievement leading to happiness
d'Tr	My daughter is not truthful	SxPu	Sexual purity
c'M	Christians are immoral	EO	Economic ownership; hoarding money[12]
jAg	Jews should be aggressive		

[12] White, "Black Boy," pp. 446-47.

cannot be taken over by the statistical method. The objective analysis of the data can serve only as a guide; it will not make his interpretation for him. He still must achieve intelligent conclusions about the meaning of the play, and he must depend upon his own insight for perceptive use of the data.

This, then, is how the method is set up; it is now time to see how the system operates. The first, cursory reading of the play must be followed by a careful and detailed examination of all the material which is to be considered in the analysis. As the critic reads, he places a symbol in the margin for each value expressed by the character. This requires precise examination of the speeches in the play, and often demands interpretation of the context of the speech. The result is a marginal account of the values expressed, as may be seen from the following example, a page taken at random from the text:

	Lod. Barabas, thou know'st I have lov'd thy daughter long.
'Tr	Bara. And so has she done you, even from a child.
	Lod. And now I can no longer hold my mind.
'Tr	Bara. Nor I the affection that I bear to you.
	Lod. This is thy diamond; tell me, shall I have it?
SxPu	Bara. Win it, and wear it, it is yet unsoil'd.
	Oh, but I know your lordship would disdain
	To marry with the daughter of a Jew:
EO>Rl	And yet I'll give her many a goldden cross
	With Christian posies round about the ring.
	Lod. 'Tis not thy wealth, but her that I esteem;

	Yet crave I thy consent.
	Bara. And mine you have, yet let me talk to her.
	This offspring of Cain, this Jebusite,
c'V	That never tasted of the Passover,
	Nor e'er shall see the land of Canaan,
	Nor our Messias that is yet to come;
c'Cl	This gentle maggot, Lodowick, I mean,
$J'Tr_c$	Must be deluded: let him have thy hand,
	But keep thy heart till Don Mathias comes.
	[Aside to her.
	Abig. What, shall I be betroth'd to Lodowick?
$J'Tr_c$	Bara. It's no sin to deceive a Christian;
	For they themselves hold it a principle,
$c'Tr_j$	Faith is not to be held with heretics:
	But all are heretics that are not Jews;
jV	This follows well, and therefore, daughter, fear not.
	[Aside to her.
'Tr	I have entreated her, and she will grant.[13]

Translating the symbols, we may note that truthfulness appears six times--always negatively, so that it is apparent that Barabas considers lying a virtue; this conclusion is strengthened by the fact that he says twice, "Jews should not be truthful to Christians." His obvious dislike of Christians is also clear from his statements that Christians are not valuable (while Jews are) and that they are unclean. Yet Barabas' religious prejudice is not based upon theological grounds; he says that economic ownership is more important than religion. His prejudice is blind, irrational, and he is quite willing to forget about religious

[13] Christopher Marlowe, "The Jew of Malta," Plays of Christopher Marlowe (London, 1954), p. 237.

differences when money is concerned.

The next step in the process of analyzing the play is to count the marginal notations and arrange them in meaningful order. Here the critic must decide precisely what it is that he is trying to evaluate, and must tabulate the data accordingly. Once he has decided which aspects of the drama he wishes to consider, his tabulations will indicate such things as particular emphases and departures from normal patterns. He need not make formal listings of the data, but he must organize them. The tables contained in this thesis are adaptations of White's method of presenting his material.[14] They are, of course, not necessary except insofar as they give a clearer indication of proportionate values. The critic, who is already immersed in his data, will not find it necessary to make such formal tabulations in order to arrive at objective and justifiable conclusions. The extra step is carried out here for the convenience of the reader. Tables II, III and IV indicate how the marginal notations in The Jew of Malta were organized.

To attempt a complete analysis of the play or a complete interpretation of these data is beyond the scope of this paper.

[14] White, "Black Boy," pp. 452, 454, 456, 457.

TABLE II

FREQUENCY WITH WHICH INDICATED VALUES ARE EXPRESSED IN EACH ACT OF THE JEW OF MALTA

Value	Act I	Act II	Act III	Act IV	Act V
Food			2	1	
Sex		2			
Rest		1			
Health	1				
Safety	14	5		3	13
Comfort		1	1		
Sex-Love		1			
Family-Love	6	7	7	1	
Friendship	2	3	9	5	5
Understanding	1	1			
Independence	1				1
Achievement	18	18	1	4	4
Dominance	9	3		2	1
Aggression	12	38	13	28	23
Recognition	9	1		3	10
Strength	1	1			
Intelligence	10	3	1	2	2
Self-Regard	2				
Stability	11			2	
Seclusion	3				1
Concealment	14	24	4	22	13
Escape					4
Beauty		1		3	
Practicality	3	1			
Economic Value	47	34	3	14	10
Hard Work	2	1			
Ownership	3	3	2	2	
Knowledge	3			1	1
Hope	2	1			
Happiness	1	4	1		1
Value-in-general	1	4		1	1
Morality	9	4		4	2
Truthfulness	9	19	2	22	3
Purity		3			
Justice	12	6		4	1
Religion	7	4	2	4	

TABLE II (continued)

Value	Act I	Act II	Act III	Act IV	Act V
Likeness	1	1			
Generosity	1	1		1	
Group Unity	2				
Determination					1
Carefulness		5		1	
Cleanness		3		2	
Moderation	2				1

TABLE III

BARABAS' TEN MOST EMPHASIZED VALUES IN THE JEW OF MALTA

Value	Emphasis Units	Percentage[a]
Aggression	114	16.3
Economic Value	108	15.5
Concealment	77	11.0
Truthfulness (negative)	55	7.9
Achievement	42	6.0
Safety	35	5.0
Friendship	24	3.5
Recognition	23	3.3
Justice	23	3.3
Family-Love	21	3.0

[a] Percentages are based on a total of 698 units of emphasis of all values mentioned. For a listing of these, see Table II.

TABLE IV

BARABAS' EVALUATION OF CHARACTERS IN THE JEW OF MALTA

Characteristics	Emphasis Units	Characteristics	Emphasis Units
Christians		**Self**	
Dangerous	1	Not having Rest	1
Not having Economic Recognition	1	Loving (daughter)	5
Unintelligent	2	Not Loving (daughter)	8
Self-Regarding	1	Not Liked	6
Concealing	1	Having Economic Achievement	9
Not Beautiful	1	Not having Economic Achievement	1
Not Valuable	3	Having Recognition	2
Immoral	4	Having Economic Recognition	3
Untruthful	3	Not Strong	1
Unjust	10	Intelligent	7
Unclean	4	Unintelligent	1
Jews		Concealing	3
Not Liked	1	Practical	1
Misunderstood	1	Having things of Economic Value	1
Not having Economic Achievement	1	Having Knowledge	5
Not Aggressive	3	Hopeful	2
Not having Economic Recognition	2	Moral	1
Unintelligent	4	Immoral	1
Concealing	1	Truthful	2
Valuable	2	Untruthful	1
Immoral	2	Generous (to daughter)	1
Stingy	1	Economically Careful	1
Daughter			
Not Loving	3		
Unintelligent	1		
Untruthful	1		

Instead, it is appropriate to suggest several directions in which interpretation based on this value-analysis can proceed. The conclusions which follow are tentative ones; all of them can be developed at length.

It is interesting to compare the results achieved through the objective analysis method with those obtained by orthodox critical procedures. The objective analysis of The Jew of Malta was completed without reference to any previous studies of Marlowe; this assured that the reported results would be derived exclusively from this analysis. After the objective analysis was completed and the conclusions formulated, Bakeless' The Tragicall History of Christopher Marlowe[15] was consulted. At this point it seems appropriate to summarize a few points of similarity and difference between the conclusions achieved by both methods.

The stereotype of Barabas as the Jewish merchant interested chiefly in money is misleading, since the analysis shows that aggression is his primary value. (Table III.) Much as he cares about wealth, he cares even more about murder, fighting, revenge. Though he also wants money, he wants it as a guarantee of safety and security; Barabas is a man of many fears. Furthermore, as his desire for

[15] John Bakeless, The Tragicall History of Christopher Marlowe (Cambridge, 1942).

aggression (most often stated as Ag--Ju, or revenge) increases throughout the play, so his emphasis on economic achievement decreases. In the list of values (pp. 12-13), both aggression and economic achievement come under the heading of "Egoistic." This inverse patterning is therefore logical. The satisfaction Barabas gets from violence replaces his need to acquire money.

Bakeless suggests that Marlowe was influenced by Machiavelli, probably via Gentillet's irate refutation of The Prince and the Discourses; he supports his thesis by reference to specific maxims which Gentillet attributes to Machiavelli. Among the most important Machiavellian borrowings exhibited in the character of Barabas is the idea of revenge, but Bakeless qualifies his idea by saying, "It is possible to exaggerate this coincidence, however, since revenge is a common human motive, and is also prominent in Seneca's plays, which influence the entire Elizabethan drama."[16] Objective analysis shows that Bakeless need not be so timid about his convictions. The revenge motif is not only "reiterated in the first two acts of the play,"[17] it is Barabas' dominating motive. There can be no coincidence; in this respect, at least, Barabas is Machiavellian.

[16] Bakeless, Marlowe, I, 351.

[17] Ibid.

Concerning the matter of structure, Barabas appears less frequently as the play progresses. The plot, so to speak, gets out of his hands, and the events which he began soon get beyond his control. The analysis also makes it clear that the climax comes in Act II and a secondary climax in Act IV, while Act III represents a temporary lull in the action. (Table II.) These conclusions support Bakeless' belief that only the first two acts are undiluted Marlowe, that Heywood or an unidentified Elizabethan hack rewrote whole portions of the play.

At the point where Barabas repudiates his daughter (see Table II: Family-Love, Act IV), his desire for friendship and affiliation with others takes the form of friendship for his slave, Ithamore. Naturally, this friendship is based more on expediency than on "desires of the heart." The analysis also shows that Barabas' protestations of love for his daughter during the first half of the play are misleading. Superficially, it would appear that he places her second only to his money. But the pattern of values which he ascribes to her (Table IV: evaluation of daughter) shows that this initial impression cannot be taken at face value.

Barabas hates nearly everyone but himself; this explains his eagerness to kill any and all. Not only does

he dislike Christians (he gives no positive values to them), but he also has a negative attitude toward Jews in general and even toward his own daughter.

Though Barabas expresses both friendship and love for his daughter (Table II) he is not much interested in being with groups. Indeed, he is a lone wolf. He sets himself apart from other Jews in Malta, and he attributes to himself values that contradict those which he credits to Jews in general (Table IV: compare evaluations of Jews and self). Barabas also talks more about himself than about all the other characters combined. (Table IV.) This suggests extreme egoism coupled with a need for independence.

Bakeless agrees that Barabas is egoistic, and that complete egoism is an idea derived from Machiavelli. But Bakeless does some further interpreting of where this egoism leads. He assumes that because Barabas is Machiavellian in some respects and because Machiavelli was interested in power, that Barabas desires power. "In The Jew of Malta Marlowe continues the theme of human lust for power--this time, the power of wealth....Barabas is as eager for power as Tamburlaine or Faustus. As governor of Malta he even adds political power to the power that his wealth has already given him."[18] This is not so.

[18] Bakeless, Marlowe, I, 353-54.

Barabas' greed for wealth is a device for achieving security, not prestige; dominance ranks low on his list of values (see Table II).

The two moral values which Barabas emphasizes most--justice and truthfulness--are peculiarly qualified by the contexts in which they appear. Almost without exception, he considers truthfulness a negative virtue, and he construes justice as the result of aggression (the revenge motif). Furthermore, he is strangely lacking in other moral values. It is true, as Bakeless suggests, that Barabas considers religion only when it is profitable to him, that his faith is often a cloak for crime.[19] But Bakeless is overemphasizing. Barabas is practically amoral, and the "religion as expediency" theme is a minor one. The marked constriction in the range of Barabas' values (see Table II) is highlighted by comparison with the typical wide range of human values (pp. 12-13).

Tamburlaine the Great. A variation of White's value-analysis methods appears in a study by Dale.[20] Among his various analyses of motion picture content, which include

[19] Bakeless, Marlowe, I, 352.

[20] Edgar Dale, The Content of Motion Pictures (New York, 1935).

such items as subject matter and locale, Dale presents a list of goals sought by leading characters in a group of 115 American films. Again, it has been necessary to restate the purpose of an analysis using his technique, since the original study viewed movies as a didactic device and was concerned with their moral effects on young children. Dale's list has been used here in the analysis of Tamburlaine the Great,[21] for the purpose of examining the goals of the major characters. It has no immediate objective other than to compare the characters, though by implication it serves to identify some of Marlowe's own ethical views.

While Dale has covered some of the same ground as White--"goals" being one aspect of White's value system--it can be seen by comparing the two lists that Dale's methods are very different. Dale has not attempted a comprehensive study; nor is his listing theory-oriented. He had no particular idea of what he expected to find in the motion pictures he studied, so his approach is strictly empirical. His list is not one of all major goals sought by human beings, as was White's; it is, instead, a compilation of

[21] Because the two parts of Tamburlaine represent a continued story, and because they deal with approximately the same ideas, I have chosen to group them together and to present the data for both parts in the same tables. They were, of course, written at different times and printed separately, in 1590 and 1606.

those goals that Dale happened to find in his material.

Furthermore, Dale based his list on statements made by various experts who saw the pictures and reported on them. The material was not organized in any fashion except for a general classification into individual, personal and social goals. The items on the list are at various levels of ordinality; moreover, there are both gaps and overlappings. Because the list is not comprehensive, one may add to it at random; it can be extended indefinitely. In fact, the list as presented in this thesis has been modified in three ways. New goals found in the new material have been added and ones which are applicable only to the motion picture subject matter have been dropped; the items have been organized into an approximation of White's order; and symbols have been added for convenience in notation. Table V is Dale's list, as adapted for the study of Tamburlaine. In this case, no person-symbols are used because it seemed expedient.to determine the authors of the various sentiments during the process of tabulation.

The process used in examining the play was the same as that applied in The Jew of Malta. A rapid reading was followed by a careful scrutiny, and the symbols were marked in the margins. In this play, the process was

TABLE V

GOALS SOUGHT BY MAJOR CHARACTERS

Individual Goals	
Co	Desire for easy life
E	Enjoyment
S-P	Self-Preservation
WL	Winning another's love
ML	Marriage for love
IL	Illicit love
Rt	Return home
Li	Liberty
IA	Independent achievement
PA	Professional achievement
FA	Financial achievement
SW	Success in war
Cr	Conquering rival
R	Revenge
SoP	Social prestige
Pu	Publicity
In	Proof of innocence
Rf	Reformation
Cn	Concealment
Es	Escape
EsP	Escape past
EsPr	Escape from present life
EsC	Escape consequences of crime
Ex	Excitement; thrills
RI	Romantic ideal
ME	Marriage for money
CE	Crime for gain
Personal Goals	
HL	Happiness of loved one
HF	Happiness of friend
HR	Happiness of relative
PF	Protection of friend
PL	Protection of loved one
PR	Protection of relative
PH	Protection of family honor
SM	Success in marriage
SL	Success of loved one
SF	Success of friend
SR	Success of relative
RL	Rescue of loved one
RF	Rescue of friend
FW	Family welfare
At	Atonement
A	Avenge another
Social Goals	
PD	Performance of duty
WM	Welfare of mankind
WC	Welfare of country
AC	Apprehension of criminal
SCr	Solution of crime
J	To see justice done
SuS	Supremacy of state
Ph	Philanthropy
W	War in defense of country[22]

[22] Dale, Motion Pictures, pp. 178, 182, 184.

simplified slightly since it was necessary to identify only the goal of the character who was speaking; the speaker's inferences about other characters were not included. The marginal notations were tallied and these data were then organized into Tables VI, VII and VIII.

Since the list upon which the analysis of Tamburlaine the Great was based is not a comprehensive one, goals other than those noted in the tables may appear in the play. However, the analysis of the data throws fresh light upon the meaning of Tamburlaine. Again, when the analysis was complete other critical works were consulted. Unfortunately, in the case of this play and Doctor Faustus, most of the available studies are historical explications of source material. There is little criticism of the drama per se.

The most striking evidence brought to light by the analysis concerns the character types: except for a few humorous and totally unsympathetic characters, the goal-patterns of all the characters are remarkably similar. (See Table VIII.) Their motivations are all in the same direction, and this happens in spite of a plot that is full of conflicts. The play has no villain. Such a basic deviation from the usual dramatic structure forces us to reappraise the play. Perhaps it was not intended for the

TABLE VI

DISTRIBUTION OF EMPHASIS AMONG ALL GOALS MENTIONED IN TAMBURLAINE THE GREAT

Goal	Units of Occurrence
Desire for easy life	5
Enjoyment	18
Self-preservation	39
Winning another's love	19
Marriage for love	4
Liberty	15
Independent achievement	87
Professional achievement	42
Financial achievement	21
Success in war	103
Conquering rival	94
Revenge	147
Social prestige	51
Publicity	8
Proof of innocence	4
Reformation	2
Concealment	8
Escape	6
Escape from present life	36
Crime for gain	4
Happiness of loved one	41
Happiness of friend	26
Happiness of relative	8
Protection of friend	38
Protection of loved one	21
Protection of relative	10
Protection of family honor	31
Success of loved one	18
Success of friend	43
Success of relative	31
Rescue of loved one	1
Atonement	2
Avenge another	14
Performance of duty	23
Welfare of mankind	8
Welfare of country	34
Apprehension of criminal	6
To see justice done	16
Supremacy of state	6
War in defense of country	7

TABLE VII

THE TEN MOST EMPHASIZED GOALS IN TAMBURLAINE THE GREAT

Goal	Emphasis Units	Percentage[a]
Revenge	147	13.4
Success in war	103	9.4
Conquering rival	94	8.5
Independent achievement	87	7.9
Social prestige	51	4.6
Success of friend	43	3.9
Professional achievement[b]	42	3.8
Happiness of loved one	41	3.7
Self-preservation	39	3.5
Protection of friend	38	3.4

[a] Percentages are based on a total of 1097 units of emphasis of all goals mentioned. For a listing of these, see Table VI.

[b] Professional achievement, as used here, denotes the goal of being a successful leader and administrator, since most of the characters seem to feel themselves best fitted to conquer and rule the world.

TABLE VIII

FREQUENCY WITH WHICH GOALS ARE EXPRESSED BY CHARACTERS

IN EACH ACT OF TAMBURLAINE THE GREAT

Goals	Part I, Act: I	II	III	IV	V	Part II, Act: I	II	III	IV	V
Mycetes										
S-P	2	1								
IA		1								
Cr		2								
R	2	2								
SoP		1								
Cn		1								
WC	1									
J	1									
Cosroe										
WC	4	3								
EsPr	1									
WM	1									
SuS	2									
PD	2	1								
W	1	1								
Cr	1	9								
R		2								
IA		1								
SF		3								
PA		3								
SW		1								
S-P		1								
Meander										
WM		1								
SW		3								
WC		1								
SF		3								
SoP		2								
Cr		1								
Theridamas										
PD	3			1		3				1
SF			1		1					1
PA			1			1				

TABLE VIII (continued)

Goals	Part I, Act: I	II	III	IV	V	Part II, Act: I	II	III	IV	V
HF					1	1				4
PF					1	1		2	1	1
SW						1		5		
FA								4		
WL								2	3	
ML									3	
SL									1	
HL									4	
IA									1	
Cr										1
R										1
Ortygius										
WC	1	1								
SF	1									
W	1									
PF	1									
PD		1								
WM		1								
SW		1								
Tamburlaine										
PF	3									
Li	2									
WC	1									
PA	2	4	4	4	1	3		4	2	1
WL	8					1				
IA	9	7	5	7	6	3	1	5	18	13
SW	5	5	4	6	1	7		7	4	7
HL	4			3	7		9			
SF	8	1	2	4	1	3		1		
FA	3		1	1	1	2			2	3
S-P	1									
Cr	1	4	4	1	2	4		5		5
HF	2	1		2		1			4	
SoP	3			4	1				7	15
SL	1			1	3	2				
WM			3		1					
J			1					2	3	
R			1	2	3		10	14	12	13
E			1	2	1				2	

TABLE VIII (continued)

Goals	Part I, Act: I	II	III	IV	V	Part II, Act: I	II	III	IV	V
Pu				1	1				5	1
PR				1						1
In					3					
ML					1					
SR						12		5	2	9
HR						1				
PH						6		3	10	6
PL							5			
EsPr							1			
AC								5		
W									1	
Techelles										
SW	1		1			1		4	1	1
SoP	1									
PD		1		1		2				1
PA		2				2				
Cr		1							1	
FA			1					3		
SF					1					
E					1					
PF						2		1	1	4
WM								1		
R									1	1
HF										1
Usumcasane										
PD	1					1				
SW	2		1			1				
SoP	2									
SF	1			1						
IA		1								
PA		1	1			1				
J			1							
PF						1			1	
A								1		
AC								1		
R									1	2
HF										3

TABLE VIII (continued)

Goals	Part I, Act: I	II	III	IV	V	Part II, Act: I	II	III	IV	V
Bajazeth										
SW			6							
WC			1							
Cr			6							
R			4	10	10					
IA			2		1					
Li			1	1	1					
S-P			1	2	1					
EsPr					8					
SoP					2					
PA					1					
HL					5					
King of Argier										
Cr			1	2						
SW			1	1						
A				1						
PL					2					
WL					3					
Soldan of Egypt										
Cr				8						
SW				1						
R				3						
A				4						
HF				1						
SoP				1						
HR					2					
Governor of Damascus										
S-P					4					
PF					3					
WC					4					
Li					1					
Agydas										
Li		2	1							
PF		1								

TABLE VIII (continued)

Goals	Part I, Act: I	II	III	IV	V	Part II, Act: I	II	III	IV	V
EsPr	1		2							
Zenocrate										
S-P	1				1					
Li	1									
WL			2							
SL			4		2		1			
SoP			1							
R			1							
PL			1	1	6	1	3			
WC				3	3					
PR				3	1	1				
HF					1					
PF					1					
A					1					
HL					1	1	3			
SR					1					
PD					1					
EsPr							1			
PH							1			
Zabina										
SL			3							
SoP			1		1					
R			3	2	8					
PL			1		1					
RL				1						
Li				1	3					
EsPr				1	7					
HL					1					
Virgins of Damascus										
S-P					4					
PF					7					
At					1					
Calyphas										
Co						1			3	
S-P						2		2	6	
SR									2	

TABLE VIII (continued)

Goals	Part I, Act: I	II	III	IV	V	Part II, Act: I	II	III	IV	V
E									2	
SoP									1	
Amyras										
SW						1			2	
SoP						1				
IA						1				
PA						1				
PH									3	
HR									1	3
PR									1	
Co									1	
R										2
PD										1
Celebinus										
IA						2				
PA						2				
SW						1				
SoP						1				
PR									1	
PH									1	
HR										1
Organes										
Cr						3	1	4	1	
SW						4	1	2		
W						1				
WC						3				
SoP						2				
PP						1				
IA						1				
E						2	1			
J							4			
R							6		4	
SF								2		
EsPr										1
King of Jerusalem										
Cr								1		

TABLE VIII (continued)

Goals	Part I, Act: I	II	III	IV	V	Part II, Act: I	II	III	IV	V
R								1	3	
EsPr										1
King of Amasia										
Cr										1
SW										1
R										4
Gazellus										
Cr						3	2			
W						1				
WC						1				
SW							1			
R							1			
Sigismund										
WC						1				
SoP						1				
PF						1				
In							1			
J							1			
R							1			
SW							1			
RF							2			
EsPr							1			
Frederiek										
WC						1	1			
R							3			
Cn							1			
Cr							1			
S-P							1			
Callapine										
SoP						2				
EsPr						5				
Li						1				
SF						5		2		
HF						3				
A						1		2		3

TABLE VIII (continued)

Goals	Part I, Act: I	II	III	IV	V	Part II, Act: I	II	III	IV	V
PA								1		
Cr								7		5
J								2		
SW								5		4
IA								1		
R								3		2
Almeda										
S-P						2				
HF						1				
CE						4				
IA						1				
PF						1				
At								1		
Governor of Babylon										
PH										1
SuS										4
Cr										3
SW										3
R										1
S-P										3
Citizens of Babylon										
S-P										3
PF										2
PR										1
Es										1
Olympia										
S-P								1		
HL								3		
Es								3	1	
EsPr									7	
Cn									5	
Others[a]										
WC	2					1		1		

TABLE VIII (continued)

Goals	Part I, Act:					Part II, Act:				
	I	II	III	IV	V	I	II	III	IV	V
J		1								
R	1						1	2	3	1
PD			1					1		
A					1					
Cr								3		
Cn							1			
W								1		
Es								1		
3F										1
FF										1
S-F										1

[a] I have arbitrarily grouped all characters with fewer than six stated values in this classification.

stage; perhaps it can be most accurately viewed as a philosophic "closet drama" dealing with certain aspects of man rather than as a portrait of literal action. Tamburlaine may make more sense if not viewed as a drama at all. Battenhouse suggests, in somewhat the same vein, that Tamburlaine may be a morality play, that some aspects are highly symbolic and metaphysical.[23]

Moreover, the motivations of the various characters are highly individualistic; personal goals which rank high on the lists are those that require antecedent conditions of strife--there is necessity for protection, for struggle to succeed. Nearly all of the characters want to succeed in one way or another; they want to win battles, to conquer their rivals, to revenge a previous defeat. They are thrown into conflict by the situation, not by conflict in their goals. There is thus an echo of fatalism in the play; everyone seeks the same things, but an ironic twist of fate pits each against the others.

Tamburlaine himself emerges from this as an atypical hero; he is the epitome of all the other characters. The characteristics possessed by all the figures in the play are not in contrast to those of the hero. It is as if

[23] Roy W. Battenhouse, Marlowe's Tamburlaine (Nashville, 1941), Ch. 1.

Marlowe used each character to represent an idea, then summed up all the ideas in the figure of Tamburlaine; he has all their qualities, but to a greater degree. Bakeless makes the same point, but only parenthetically; furthermore, he considers it a fault in Marlowe: "[Tamburlaine] first gave dramatic unity to English tragedy by using a single hero, surrounded by other characters who seem his mere shadows."[24]

Doctor Faustus. Still another schema for character analysis appears in Murray's book, Explorations in Personality.[25] As part of a comprehensive study of fifty undergraduates at Harvard, Murray has made a list of basic human needs. This list of needs is similar in comprehensiveness to the list that White made. Murray's research was not designed for an immediate or practical end; thus his categories were not limited to a single situation.

The list as adapted here for the analysis of Doctor Faustus is confined to what Murray calls "secondary needs"; in other words, they are those needs which are probably not

[24] Bakeless, Marlowe, I, 245.

[25] Henry A. Murray, Explorations in Personality (New York, 1938).

innate or instinctive, but are acquired through social learning. They include all of the needs basic to human nature except the physiological ones--food, sex, and so forth. Murray makes a separate list of physiological needs which have been excluded here as of no particular value to this kind of study. Again, as in The Jew of Malta, only the speeches of the main character have been analyzed. Other characters who attribute needs to Faustus might be mistaken or misled by superficial knowledge.

The needs listed in Table IX were used in the analysis of Doctor Faustus; and, since these terms may be unfamiliar to the reader, a brief description of each term is included. The categories into which the needs are organized are merely rough divisions of subject matter. The symbol "n" represents "need" throughout.

The data in Table X are derived from marginal notations of Murray's list of needs, and simply indicate the relative strength of the various needs. Since the play is not divided into acts, it is impossible to tabulate the changes in Faustus' needs by act, nor has the analysis included his evaluations of other characters.

Actually, Faustus' most important drive--the need for cognizance--is fairly persistent, though it decreases slightly in importance as the play progresses. The needs

TABLE IX

INDIVIDUAL NEEDS

Inanimate objects		
nAcq	n Acquisition	To gain possessions and property. To grasp, snatch or steal things. To bargain or gamble. To work for money or goods.
nOrd	n Order	To arrange, organize, put away objects. To be tidy and clean. To be scrupulously precise.
nRet	n Retention	To retain possession of things. To refuse to give or lend. To hoard.
nCons	n Construction	To organize and build.
Ambition		
nSup	n Superiority	A combination of n Achievement and n Recognition.
nAch	n Achievement	To overcome obstacles, to exercise power, to strive to do something difficult as well and as quickly as possible.
nRec	n Recognition	To excite praise and commendation. To demand respect. To boast and exhibit one's accomplishments. To seek distinction or social prestige.
nExh	n Exhibition	Possibly a part of the Recognition drive. To attract attention to one's person. To excite, amuse, shock others. Self-dramatization.
Defense of status		
nInv	n Inviolacy	A combination of n Seclusion, n Infavoidance, n Defendance and n Counteraction.
nSec	n Seclusion	To isolate oneself. To be reticent. Self-concealment.
nInf	n Infavoidance	To avoid failure, shame, humiliation, ridicule. To refrain from attempting to do something that is beyond one's powers.
nDfd	n Defendance	To defend oneself against blame or belittlement. To justify one's actions. To offer extenuations, explanations and excuses.
nCnt	n Counteraction	Proudly to overcome defeat by

TABLE IX (continued)

		restriving and retaliating. To select the hardest tasks.
Human power		
nDom	n Dominance	To influence or control others. To persuade, to lead and direct.
nDef	n Deference	To admire and willingly follow a superior. To co-operate with a leader. To serve gladly.
nAuto	n Autonomy	To resist influence or coercion. To strive for independence.
Sadism and masochism		
nAgg	n Aggression	To assault or injure. To murder. To belittle, harm, blame, accuse or maliciously ridicule a person.
nAba	n Abasement	To surrender. To comply and accept punishment. To apologize, confess, atone. Self-depreciation.
Inhibition		
nBlam	n Blamavoidance	To avoid blame, ostracism or punishment by inhibiting asocial or unconventional impulses.
Affection		
nAff	n Affiliation	To form friendships and associations. To co-operate, to love, to join groups.
nRej	n Rejection	To snub, ignore or exclude. To remain aloof and indifferent.
nNur	n Nurturance	To nourish, aid or protect someone helpless. To express sympathy.
nSuc	n Succorance	To seek aid, protection or sympathy. To plead for mercy.
nPlay	n Play	To relax, amuse oneself. To avoid serious tension.
Intellectual		
nCog	n Cognizance	To ask questions. To satisfy curiosity. To seek knowledge.
nExp	n Exposition	To demonstrate. To relate facts. To explain, interpret, lecture.
nUnd	n Understanding	To conceptualize relations, to create a structure of ideas.[26]

[26] Murray, Explorations, Ch.II and III, passim.

TABLE X

FAUSTUS' NEEDS IN ORDER OF IMPORTANCE IN *DOCTOR FAUSTUS*

Need	Emphasis Units
Cognizance	55
Deference	40
Abasement	40
Dominance	30
Superiority	29
Achievement	19
Defendence	19
Succorance	15
Acquisition	14
Aggression	14
Play	10
Recognition	9
Autonomy	9
Affiliation	7
Counteraction	5
Exposition	5
Infavoidance	4
Blamavoidance	3
Nurturance	3
Understanding	3
Invidiacy	2
Seclusion	2
Retention	1

to seek protection and to abase himself (n Succorance and n Abasement) increase steadily, so that in the last scenes he engages in practically nothing but a continuous self-depreciation and plea for help (in this case, from God). The need for play is nearly always accompanied by an implicit desire for aggression, since all of Faustus' jokes are more or less malicious ones. His fun is always at the expense of someone else.

The analysis of these data makes several points clear. Faustus is dominated by a desire to know, though his knowledge is of a peculiar order. He wants facts, he asks questions continually, but he seldom attempts to put the knowledge thus gained in any order. He wants only isolated information, not theory. (In this context, note that n Understanding is nearly at the bottom of this list.) Furthermore, Faustus apparently wants his knowledge only for his own purposes. He is not particularly interested in communicating to others (n Exposition) or even in achieving status by means of his knowledge. As long as he can feel himself superior, he cares little for what others may think.

The analysis also demonstrates that, for Faustus, the need to defer to the opinions of others and to surrender to authority (n Deference and n Abasement) are highly important. Though he wants to feel superior to other men,

he also wants to place himself clearly within a social structure where he, in turn, can defer to other leaders or "strong men"--in this case, God and Lucifer. Even after he has acquired some little lore of necromancy, Faustus is deferential in his behavior to human characters whom he feels have greater social prestige. He is exceedingly polite to the Emperor of Germany. This, of course, suggests several things, among them that Faustus is a good example of the authoritarian or fascistic personality.[27] Perhaps he is not so nearly "Everyman, seduced by greed and pride," as he is the anti-democratic man in search of a desirable niche in a rigid and imposed order.[28]

Bakeless, however, seems to be so caught in the traditional interpretations of Faustus' character that he misses the point. He reads into the play a partial autobiography of the author and sees Faustus as a man not responsible for his own misfortunes. "In this play we come closer than in anything else he ever wrote to the proud, fiery, agonized

[27] For further information on anti-democratic tendencies, see T.W. Adorno *et al.*, *The Authoritarian Personality* (New York, 1950).

[28] With the prototype of Faust set up by Marlowe, it was no accident that Goethe seized upon this figure. The German culture of the early nineteenth century emphasized the authoritarian personality, and the emphasis--already a persistent tradition in German philosophy--was to be repeated in the ideas of Nietzsche and Hitler.

spirit of the poet himself, grasping forever at what he never would attain, the scholar 'still climbing after knowledge infinite,' and the man hopelessly caught in a web that was not of his own weaving."[29] This is nonsense.

Several other critics dismiss both Faustus and Tamburlaine by calling them "autobiographical"; among them is Boas, who romanticizes the figure of Faustus, types him as a personable young innocent and completely ignores the structure of the drama. He sums up his analysis in one final bit of sentimentality: "The Faustus who, in the grasp of Mephistophilis, cries in despair, 'I'll burn my books,' is after twenty-four years still the Faustus who at the opening of the play was brooding over his 'studies.' Flights of angels are bidden sing Hamlet to his rest. Faustus is carried off by devils. But for both students of Wittenberg Horatio's words may serve as epitaph, 'Now cracks a noble heart'."[30]

Some attempt has also been made during the course of this study to find or create schemata for areas other than character analysis. This has presented various problems.

[29] Bakeless, Marlowe, I, 275.

[30] Frederick S. Boas, The Tragical History of Doctor Faustus (London, 1932), p. 41.

For example, in trying to make a list of subjects common to Renaissance literature and in attempting to group these subjects according to their origins in the various traditions--Christian humanism, medieval chivalry, classical mythology, and so forth--one soon begins chasing one's tail. The problem here is similar to that faced by the Freudian psychoanalyst: given a specific syndrome in a patient, how can the analyst know from what influence it arose? It is all too easy to subjugate the data to a preconceived scheme, and such a scheme is neither all-inclusive nor necessarily pertinent. An analyst, for example, may attribut a patient's "neurasthenic" symptoms to a repressed conflict, only to discover later that the symptoms are eliminated by thyroxin medication.

A parallel can be drawn in literature. For instance, the subject of the courtier occurs frequently in Renaissance literature. If we use a method comparable to the Freudian one, we immediately conclude that the courtier's place in our list is under the heading of Plato's philosopher-king. But is it? Could it not just as well belong to a set of ideas originating from the actual experience of governing in Renaissance courts? This is the trouble with every method that is genetic; hindsight is far too clear, and it is far too easy to oversimplify. We do not know the real

origins of anything; when we try to organize such origins or influences we impose a structure which is not, and never was, really there.

In science, this is called the genetic fallacy. The assumption that certain past occurrences are responsible for present occurrences cannot be used as proof that the assumed origins are the real ones. Nothing is proved by this sort of circular logic. In other words, we cannot say that the emphasis on courtiers arose from Plato's philosopher-king, then prove our theory by going back through the literature to Plato. We have merely retraced our original steps. A critic who made use of a subject-matter list would need to be fully aware of these limitations, to remember constantly that his classifications of tradition and historical origin were purely arbitrary.

A list of subject matter common to the Renaissance, or to any other period, could be made. Formulation of such a list would require a careful study of all the appropriate literature, or of a representative sample, followed by a tabultation and the establishment of a taxonomy for the data.[31] Lists of subject matter in the field of propaganda, and a

[31] However, one cannot generate such a schema from a single body of material without creating severe limitations of the sort found in Dale's list.

report of the methods by which they were conceived, appear in Language of Politics, an excellent study of the use of content analysis methods in analyzing political propaganda.[32] Such lists would be most valuable to the critic making a comparative study.

[32] Harold D. Lasswell, Nathan Leites, et al., Language of Politics (New York, 1949).

CHAPTER III

CONCLUSIONS

Obviously, statistics will never replace the critic; literature can never be subjected to analysis by Univac. There are still aspects of every imaginative work to which the objective analysis process does not apply, where only the individual critic's insight and knowledge will produce results. Nevertheless, it seems likely that this method can be extended beyond the scope of a specific play or novel or poem. It would be possible to apply objective analysis to a group of authors in a given period, or to apply the same criteria to the whole body of work by a given author. In both cases, the results would lead to value judgments on an author, to analysis of his creativity and imagination, or to conclusions about the chronological development of his values.

An analysis of subject matter, rather than of characters, would be an invaluable tool, particularly in the field of comparative literature; to set up schemata for such a study would present few problems. Analysis of central themes and ideas, or of minor but recurrent themes, would also be a field worthy of study, but there the

problem lies in creating lists with which to work. At present, none are available, and no field of science concerns itself with this problem. Of course, further study in content analysis may produce such lists; but for the moment at least, the social psychologist's most valuable contributions are the schemata for analyzing character.

In this thesis, the objective analysis technique has been illustrated by three different schemata. Each serves a different purpose. White's schema seems to yield the most fruitful information; Dale's appears to be the weakest of the three. White's scheme is a better one because of its comprehensiveness. It allows comparison of a study with the master list--and thus permits examination of where a character's values fall in the pattern of general human values. By the use of symbol combinations, it permits the critic to include not only explicitly stated goals, but also statements about accomplishments and desires, and inferences made by one character about another. Dale's list permits none of these things. It has been included in this thesis as another example of how material may be approached; and it perhaps has an advantage for the critic who is interested in scope rather than in depth, since it is less time-consuming. Murray's list comes closer to

White's in comprehensiveness, but it is not as detailed; nor are the categories quite as suitable for literary criticism.

At least one other question merits consideration: the definition of the quantitative unit. In other words, does the critic need to concern himself primarily with the size of the unit which he is analyzing? Does he need to be careful of whether his data come from the phrase, the sentence or the paragraph? Probably not. Of course, one should not confuse the extremely important idea with the very minor point; but the critic may content himself with qualitative, rather than quantitative, data. The quantitative unit is a problem for the scientist, but it seems likely that the literary critic can disregard all but common sense application of it.

On the whole, the method seems highly practical. The expert or semi-experienced critic can use it in its present form. It could easily be simplified for use in school curricula, for teaching critical reading of literature to beginners in the field. Furthermore, it is actually time-saving once the analyst learns the method and becomes familiar with the symbols. The time spent in acquainting oneself with a particular list is more than recompensed by the fact that no time need be wasted in a random search for

examples to prove one's point.

And all this leaves one last question: how important is all this? The method is a plan for the construction of a machine, a mechanism that will assist the critic in working out literary themes, subjects, ideas, characters. It will be useful and time-saving and thought-provoking as long as it is carefully and correctly used. In this sense, it is a contribution to knowledge. One must remember, however, that it is only a model which must be constantly changed and improved toward an ultimately perfect goal. The results of any study can be no better than the model; the model is valuable only in the hands of an intelligent human. It is not perfect. It is not all-inclusive. On the other hand, no one has yet discovered the ideal method of literary criticism; and until someone does, objective analysis as an intermediary step in such criticism provides at least a hope for better critical studies.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adorno, T.W., et al. The Authoritarian Personality. New York: Harpers, 1950.

Bakeless, John. The Tragicall History of Christopher Marlowe. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1942.

Battenhouse, Roy W. Marlowe's Tamburlaine. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1941.

Boas, Frederick S. The Tragical History of Doctor Faustus. London: Methuen and Co. Ltd., 1932.

Dale, Edgar. The Content of Motion Pictures. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1935.

Hart, A. Shakespeare and the Homilies. Melbourne, Australia: Melbourne University Press, 1934, Ch. 4.

Lasswell, Harold D., Nathan Leites, et al. Language of Politics. New York: George W. Stewart, Inc., 1949.

Marlowe, Christopher. The Plays of Christopher Marlowe. London: Oxford University Press, 1954.

Miles, Josephine. The Continuity of Poetic Language: Studies in English Poetry From the 1540's to the 1940's. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1951.

Murray, Henry A. Explorations in Personality. New York: Oxford University Press, 1938.

Rickert, Edith. New Methods for the Study of Literature. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1927.

Spurgeon, Caroline F.E. Shakespeare's Imagery and What it Tells Us. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1936.

White, Ralph K., "Black Boy: A Value Analysis," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLII, 1947, 440-461.